



ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT

CRITICAL MANAGEMENT STUDIES DIVISION

5-YEAR REVIEW

FEBRUARY 2018

Lead authors:

Banu Özkazanç-Pan, CMS Division Co-Chair

Paul Donnelly, CMS Division Co-Chair

With members of the CMS Executive:

Nimruji Jammulamadaka, CMS Past Division Chair

Mark Learmonth, CMS Division Chair-Elect

Stephen Cummings, CMS Division Program Co-Chair

Ajnesh Prasad, CMS Division Program Co-Chair

Patrizia Zanoni, CMS Division Program Co-Chair-Elect

Marcos Barros, CMS Division Program Co-Chair-Elect

Arturo Osorio, CMS Division Treasurer

Patrizia Hoyer, CMS Division Representative-at-Large

Nadia deGama, CMS Division Representative-at-Large

Garance Marechal, CMS Division Representative-at-Large

Fernanda Sauerbronn, CMS Division Representative-at-Large

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
CMS Division Strengths and Areas to Develop	4
<i>Membership</i>	4
<i>Participation</i>	6
<i>Satisfaction</i>	10
<i>Finances</i>	13
2013 Division Review: Progress on Issues/Initiatives	15
<i>Division Review Report (2013)</i>	15
<i>Division & Interest Group Committee Feedback (2013)</i>	19
Aspirations and Initiatives for 2018 to 2022	24
Appendix A — Supplementary Data Tables	28
Appendix B — Health and Governance Checklist	31

INTRODUCTION

For the Critical Management Studies (CMS) Division, 2018 marks the 20th anniversary of the CMS Workshops and the 10th anniversary of the move from a Special Interest Group to a full Division of the Academy of Management.

In accordance with Academy of Management bylaws, this report presents a five-year review (2013 to 2017, inclusive) of the Division, along with taking a forward look for the coming five-year period (2018 to 2022, inclusive).

We are indebted to current and past officers of the Division Executive for their time, energy and commitment in serving our members, and for the work they have done in building the Division to where it is today. We thank our active and engaged membership, particularly the 199 members who completed the membership survey. Finally, we are grateful to the staff at Academy of Management HQ, particularly Kerry Ignatz, for all their support throughout.

In the report that follows, we identify the Division's key strengths and areas in need of development. We consider progress made in relation to the issues and initiatives discussed in the 2013 Division Review Report, along with the challenges noted in the Division and Interest Group Relations Committee response to the 2013 report. Finally, and with a view to the future, we outline aspirations and initiatives for the coming five-year period, drawing on the results of the survey with our membership, Academy data, and the 2013 review.

CMS DIVISION STRENGTHS AND AREAS TO DEVELOP

Drawing on the member survey —held between October 17th and November 17th, 2017, with a response rate of almost 30 per cent— and data from the Academy covering the period 2013 to 2017, we present a self-reflection on the Division covering the past five years, celebrating strengths and noting areas in need of further development.

MEMBERSHIP

In the overall, Division membership has stabilized in or around the 750-member mark over the period under review (see Table 1). As such, the decline in membership noted in the previous review has been staunch. Indeed, based on extensive interactions with the membership in the early part of 2017, the decline of almost four per cent between 2016 and 2017 is likely a response to the U.S. Presidential Executive Orders banning travel from a number of Muslim-majority countries. We know from those interactions that members held strong views about these orders, up to and including withdrawing from attending the annual meeting and not renewing membership of the Academy. Had it not been for this, it is quite likely that membership would have been at least as high as that of the previous two years. These observations are supported by quotes from members, such as “it is time to have annual meetings outside of the U.S. until the people of the U.S. can elect themselves a president that espouses and acts in alignment with the values of equity, diversity, and inclusion” as one example. Further, the increase in submissions in 2018 (130 papers, 12 symposia and 14 PDWs) over 2017 (80 papers, 10 symposia and 13 PDWs) serves to reinforce the disproportionate effect of the travel ban orders on the Division.

Table 1: Membership

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	5-year change	Annual Avg. Change
CMS	741	727	772	769	743	0.27%	0.07%
AOM	19,355	19,341	19,581	20,048	20,201	4.37%	1.08%

Looking further into the data, we see an inverse relationship between U.S. membership and international membership, with the former falling and the latter increasing between 2013 and 2016 (see Table 2). Once again, events of early 2017 have likely impacted international membership numbers for 2017, given they were on an upward trajectory in all prior years. It would seem that relative stability in U.S. membership numbers over 2016 and 2017 indicates we have reached the point where we are no longer losing U.S. members. The decline is something we would like to understand further — e.g., it could be due to a declining critical scholarship presence in U.S. business schools, it could be due to retirements, etc.— thus requiring we develop insight and, as appropriate, pursue initiatives to re-build our U.S. membership.

Table 2: Membership by U.S. / International

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	5-year change	Annual Avg. Change
CMS U.S.	251	234	244	219	217	-13.55%	-3.57%
CMS International	490	493	528	550	526	7.35%	1.79%
AOM U.S.	10,305	10,196	9,987	10,068	10,233	-0.70%	-0.18%
AOM International	9,050	9,145	9,594	9,980	9,968	10.14%	2.44%

When it comes to membership type (see Table 3), we see growth in the Academic and Emeritus categories, with declines in the Executive and Student categories. As already mentioned, events of early 2017 have likely impacted membership numbers in all categories.

The trend in the Academic membership category (73 per cent of members in 2017) was upwards and it is likely that 2017 would have been at least as high as the prior two years were it not for reasons already mentioned. When we look deeper into the data (see Appendix: Tables A6 and A7), we see that International academic membership fell by over six per cent in 2017, which goes against the solid upward trend of the preceding four years.

Turning to the next largest membership group, students (18.5 per cent of members in 2017), we saw a drop off in numbers in 2017 following what had been a positive trend since 2014. Again, when we look deeper into the data (see Appendix: Tables A6 and A7), we see that International student numbers saw some decline in 2014 and 2015, but rebounded in 2016 and remained the same in 2017. However, U.S. student numbers show a negative trend, which could well be to do with a declining critical scholarship presence in U.S. business schools, such that U.S. students are not being exposed to critical scholarship as part of their training. The decline should also be seen in the context of an overall negative trend in U.S. student membership of the Academy.

As concerns Executive membership (6 per cent of members in 2017), the trend has been negative for both the Division and the Academy, albeit numbers have fluctuated upwards and downwards for the Division, while they are on a solid downward trend for the Academy since 2014. Looking at the data more closely (see Appendix: Tables A6 and A7), we see the same pattern for U.S. and International Executive members, with the Academy numbers decreasing at a faster pace for International Executive members.

Emeritus membership (2.5 per cent of members in 2017) for the Division, though small, is consistently growing at a faster rate than that of the Academy. Should they be willing, our Emeritus members represent a wealth of experience that could well be tapped to the advantage of our doctoral student and early career scholar members, in particular.

Finally, and on a brighter note, the Division is attracting new members and doing so at an above average rate when compared with the Academy. However, it is clear that the Division losing members in almost equal measure offsets this healthy trend, such that the overall membership number remains relatively static. The member survey indicates that about a third of respondents attend the annual meeting each year, thus renewing their membership, suggesting that we could well be losing renewals due to people not participating in the annual meeting and thus not maintaining their membership. This is something we will look into further, to see what we can do to encourage members to renew in the absence of them attending the annual meeting.

Table 3: Membership by Member Type

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	5-year change	Annual Avg. Change
<i>CMS Academic</i>	532	538	575	571	545	2.44%	0.61%
<i>CMS Emeritus</i>	13	13	14	16	18	38.46%	8.48%
<i>CMS Executive</i>	56	53	60	38	43	-23.21%	-6.39%
<i>CMS Student</i>	140	123	123	144	137	-2.14%	-0.54%
<i>CMS New Members</i>	101	107	124	76	131	29.70%	6.72%
<i>AOM Academic</i>	12,805	12,820	13,030	13,553	13,619	6.38%	1.55%
<i>AOM Emeritus</i>	349	380	405	402	411	17.77%	4.17%
<i>AOM Executive</i>	1,384	1,410	1,393	1,249	1,153	-16.69%	-4.46%
<i>AOM Student</i>	4,817	4,731	4,753	4,848	5,018	4.17%	1.03%
<i>AOM New Members</i>	2,786	2,886	2,906	3,194	3,430	23.12%	5.34%

Turning to the member survey (Table 4), we can see that members identify strongly with the Division, with almost 80 per cent of members considering the Division either their primary affiliation or one they identify with almost as much as their primary division.

Table 4: Member Survey – Primary division/interest group

	Yes, definitely	Yes, but I identify with another division almost as much	No, but I identify with CMS almost as much as my primary division	No, I identify mostly with another division
CMS Division	36.11%	33.33%	9.72%	20.83%

When asked if they would recommend to a colleague to join the Division (see Table 5), over 78 per cent of members answered in the affirmative, with a further 20 per cent saying they possibly would.

Table 5: Member Survey – Recommend a colleague join CMS Division

	Yes	No	Possibly
CMS Division	78.54%	1.37%	20.09%

As to their reasons for belonging to the Division (see Table 6), members ranked gaining and sharing information relevant to research as their most important (weighted average of 4.33 on a 5-point scale), with developing and maintaining social connections next most important (3.13), followed by gaining and sharing information relevant to teaching (2.87).

Table 6: Member Survey – Reason for belonging to CMS Division

<i>Weighted average on a 5-point scale</i>	Gain and share information relevant to research	Gain and share information relevant to teaching	Gain and share information relevant to training and management practice	To learn more about a domain that is new to me	Develop and maintain social connections
CMS Division	4.33	2.87	2.36	2.48	3.13

All in all, membership numbers have remained relatively stable at around the 750-member mark over the past five years, with International membership continuing to grow. That almost 80 per cent of members see the Division as their primary affiliation or identify with as much as their primary division, and that over 78 per cent would recommend a colleague join the Division, speaks to a healthy level of solidarity amongst members with the Division. By far the most important reason for belonging to the Division is to gain and share information relevant to research, with developing and maintaining social connections also quite important.

Had it not been for the political events of early 2017, it is quite likely that we would have seen overall membership numbers remain at least as high as they were in 2015 and 2016, which would have represented a relatively healthy trend. The Division is obviously attracting new members, albeit losing almost as many who do not renew their membership, the reasons for which we need to more clearly understand. It is also clear that we need to better understand the decline in U.S.-based members (Academic and Student) and in Executive members.

PARTICIPATION

When we look first to participation in the 2017 member survey, the response rate was 30 per cent, which is ahead of the average of 27 per cent for divisions completing reviews this cycle and the 28 per cent response rate for the 2013 Division review.

In terms of election participation (see Table 4), in all but one of the past five years (2015), voting in Division elections was well ahead of the Academy average. Indeed, while participation in Division elections has stabilized at above 27 per cent for the past three years, the level of Academy participation has seen a steady decline over the same period. Notwithstanding the relatively healthy voter turnout as compared to that of the Academy, there is always room to improve participation in the Division’s elections.

Table 7: Election Participation

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
CMS Membership Voting %	33.33%	30.88%	27.79%	27.10%	27.59%
AOM Membership Voting %	27.61%	26.65%	27.89%	24.12%	22.94%

In terms of annual meeting registrants (Table 8), while there is more of a fluctuation from year to year than for the Academy, the Division saw greater growth in registrants on a five-year change basis than the Academy.

When we look deeper into the data (see Appendix: Tables A8 and A9), we see there has been growth in all registrant categories but one for the Division on a five-year change basis. In terms of the average annual change, the Division saw a smaller decrease in U.S. Academic registrants (-0.36 per cent) as against the Academy (-2.95 per cent), along with a smaller decrease in total U.S. registrants (-1.37 per cent) compared to the Academy (-2.84 per cent). While the growth in total International registrants (24.84 per cent) has outpaced that of the Academy (18.71 per cent) on a five-year change basis, the average annual change shows total International registrants decreasing more for the Division (-5.39 per cent) than the Academy (-4.20 per cent).

We note that 2014 (Philadelphia) and 2015 (Vancouver) saw a higher proportion of Division members attend than for the Academy. Anecdotally, we are aware that Anaheim (2016) was not a venue that appealed to Division members, particularly our international members, hence the fall off in registrants. The events of early 2017 saw international members, in particular, voice their intent not to attend the annual meeting in Atlanta because they no longer felt welcome. We also have to recognize that funding and time are issues that impact on the ability of members to attend the annual meeting (see further discussion below related to Tables 11 and 12).

Assuming no further actions by the current U.S. administration, and assuming the events of early 2017 have not led to a permanent change in international members' willingness to travel to the U.S. for the annual meeting, the change to cycling the annual meeting between Chicago (IL), Boston (MA), Vancouver (BC, Canada), Philadelphia (PA) and Seattle (WA) may see the fluctuations in registrants stabilize. Indeed, this may also benefit the Academy, which saw an annual average decrease in total registrants (-3.46 per cent) over the past five years, marginally better than the Division (-4.02 per cent).

Table 8: Annual Meeting Registrants

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	5-year change	Annual Avg. Change
CMS Members	241	357	382	321	284	17.84%	-4.02%
CMS Registrants / Membership	32.52%	49.11%	49.48%	41.74%	38.22%		
AOM Members	7,906	8,876	9,509	9,011	9,100	15.10%	-3.46%
AOM Registrants / Membership	40.85%	45.89%	48.56%	44.95%	45.05%		

Looking at annual meeting submissions (Table 6), it is clear that the Division is not attracting submissions at anywhere near the rate of the overall Academy when looked at in relation to membership nor at a rate that reflects the level of participation at annual meetings in terms of Division registrants. This has resulted in a higher acceptance rate relative to the overall Academy, albeit this is not as much of a concern for the Division given our preference to view and treat conference paper sessions as opportunities for development. It could well be that Division members are submitting their work to other divisions, reflecting concern expressed by some that there are insufficient publishing outlets that welcome critical scholarship. To address this concern, for example, we intentionally showcase journals (e.g., *critical perspective in international business*; *Gender, Work and Organization*; *Journal of Business Ethics*; *Management Learning*; *Organization*;

Organization Studies; Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management) that welcome critical scholarship at the doctoral student and early career consortia, and through partnering with journals for our annual awards (i.e., *critical perspective in international business; Journal of Business Ethics; Management Learning; Organization; Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*), which we highlight in our communications.

Altogether, while we are concerned to be developmental, we do not wish to see quality of submissions diluted to the point where members lose interest. Thus, we have work to do to encourage more submissions from our members, while at the same time cognizant of our wish to balance quality with a developmental focus.

Table 9: Annual Meeting Submissions

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
CMS Submissions	129	134	170	144	103
CMS Submissions/Membership	17.41%	18.43%	22.02%	18.73%	13.86%
CMS Acceptance Rate	68.22%	62.69%	63.53%	65.28%	71.84%
AOM Submissions	7,406	7,673	8,714	8,135	7,833
AOM Submissions/Membership	38.26%	39.67%	44.50%	40.58%	38.78%
AOM Acceptance Rate	50.61%	58.58%	56.35%	62.27%	64.93%

In terms of members participating as reviewers (Table7), the Division experiences quite a healthy participation rate when viewed in the context of the number of submissions received, such that there has been a sufficient number of reviewers to comfortably accomplish the review task over the past five years.

Table 10: Annual Meeting Reviewers

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
CMS Reviewers	152	214	231	210	186
CMS Reviewers/Membership	20.51%	29.44%	29.92%	27.31%	25.03%
CMS Reviewers/Submission	1.2	1.6	1.4	1.5	1.8
AOM Reviewers	6,197	6,265	6,572	6,496	7,048
AOM Reviewers/Membership	32.02%	32.39%	33.56%	32.40%	34.89%
AOM Reviewers/Submission	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9

Turning to the member survey (Table 11), about a third of respondents attend the annual meeting every year, with about another third doing so only when on the program. It is important to note that the Division has a higher proportion of international members (about 2.5 times more international than U.S. members) compared to the Academy (about an equal amount of international and U.S. members). Thus, there are cost (and time) considerations related to international travel and the relative income levels of our international members; we must recognize that some of our international members do not enjoy the sort of salaries and funding support available in U.S. business schools.

Table 11: Member Survey – How frequently attend Academy’s annual meeting

	Pretty much every year	Only when on the program	Once in a while	Rarely	Never
CMS Division	32.08%	32.08%	14.15%	8.96%	12.74%

For those who do not attend the annual meeting (see Table 12), funding is by far the greatest reason, followed by not having time to attend. For a not insignificant number of members (27 per cent), the annual meeting is either not of interest to them or is not the primary reason to belong to the Academy. That a sizeable proportion of members say they are unable to attend, or uninterested in attending, the annual meeting also possibly speaks to the lower level of submissions the Division receives as a percentage of our membership base as compared to the Academy, i.e., the less likely a member is to be able to attend the annual meeting, the less likely s/he will make a submission.

As reasons, the lack of both funding and time speak to the general trend of work intensification allied with funding cuts in academia, such that people are under pressure to do more (thus less time) with less resources (thus less funding). Further, it is likely that many of our members, particularly those from Europe, attend the biannual CMS conference, which directly competes with our Division.

All reasons for not attending point to the importance of building community outside of the annual meeting itself to cater for the needs of these members and potential members looking for such community. This is where the Academy’s new platform, Connect@AOM, offers the Division possibilities for building community not available to this point. Further, given that many of our members are from the Global South, we see affordability as an important factor in decisions to attend the annual meetings. This is an area we would like to explore further with the Academy in order to expand opportunities for scholars who may be unable to afford attending the conference.

Table 12: Member Survey – Reasons for not attending Academy’s annual meeting

	Do not have access to funding	Do not have time to attend	Not interested in attending	Belong to Academy for benefits other than annual meeting
CMS Division	54.61%	37.50%	12.50%	14.47%

Looking to the level of engagement members surveyed had in Division annual meeting activities over the past five years (see Table 13), it is not surprising that this seems on the low side given that almost two thirds of members are not able to attend frequently or do not have an interest in attending. It also tallies with the lower level of submissions the Division receives as a percentage of our membership base compared to that of the Academy.

Table 13: Member Survey – Engagement in annual meeting activities for CMS Division during past five years

<i>Weighted average on a 5-point scale</i>	Served as a reviewer	2.57	Served as chair / discussant	1.56
	Presented at PDW	1.71	Attended scholarly session	2.80
	Attended PDW	2.41	Participated in other activities	2.66
CMS Division	Presented at scholarly session	2.16	Volunteered in some capacity	1.44

Overall, we see a relatively healthy level of participation in terms of voting in the Division elections and serving as reviewers of annual meeting submissions. We are cognizant that the annual meeting is not the primary reason for belonging to the Division or Academy for a sizeable number of members, hence our interest to utilize Connect@AOM to build community.

Although Division member participation in the annual meeting has fluctuated from year to year, the number of total registrants has grown compared to five years ago. However, we note the Division is not attracting submissions at anywhere near the rate of the overall Academy, which is something we will need to look at in greater depth to build an understanding as to why this is so.

Notwithstanding the increase in annual meeting registrants compared to five years ago, we recognize there are cost and time considerations for our members, particularly our international members, in attending the annual meeting. We also recognize that U.S. Administration policies and actions, such as the 2017 travel bans, materially impact participation in the annual meeting by the Division’s international members who feel less welcome in the U.S. as a result.

SATISFACTION

In terms of overall satisfaction with their membership of the Division (see Table 14), it is heartening to note that over 85 per cent of members surveyed are satisfied / very satisfied / extremely satisfied. This is encouragement for those of us on the Division Executive to continue delivering for our members so as to further strengthen and grow our community.

Table 14: Member Survey – Overall satisfaction with the CMS Division

	Extremely satisfied	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Not satisfied
CMS Division	15.58%	31.16%	38.69%	12.08%	2.51%

Looking into member satisfaction in somewhat more detail (see Table 15), it is clear that members are largely satisfied across all categories surveyed, including a high level of satisfaction with activities that address the Division’s domain (weighted average of 3.44 on a 5-point scale).

It is encouraging that there is a high level of satisfaction with the sense of community (3.48), to include being welcoming of members from various demographic groups (3.63), efforts to reach out to international members (3.51), efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions (3.25), and encouragement from Division leaders to form network communities for people like me (3.08).

Likewise, from a governance perspective, it is reassuring that there is a high level of satisfaction with elections being fair and open (3.92), Division officers being responsive to member concerns (3.68), the ability of interested members to become Division leaders (3.52), the selection process for awards and recognition (3.57), and opportunities to influence the Division (3.39).

When it comes to Division communications, again the high level of satisfaction is encouraging: level of communication from the Division (3.44), quality of newsletter (3.58), usefulness of website (3.31) and value of listservs (3.36). Worth observing here is that the Division established a Twitter presence in August 2015 that currently counts over 1,100 followers, indicating a broader CMS community than our Academy base.

Though the three quarters of members who expressed their level of satisfaction with the opportunities outside of annual meeting to network/collaborate with peers were more satisfied than not (2.97), it is clear that this is an area where we can deliver more value for members, for example, through maximizing the potential of Connect@AOM.

While mentoring was not applicable for four out of ten members surveyed, for the remainder who expressed their level of satisfaction with opportunities to receive mentoring (2.68), it is clear that this is an area where we need to build greater understanding of who is interested in mentoring and how best that can be brought about. It could well be that mentoring is something of interest to doctoral students and early career scholars, who represent the Division’s future, so addressing this need is to the Division’s benefit.

Table 15: Member Survey – Satisfaction with CMS Division

Weighted average on a 5-point scale				
CMS Division	Sense of community within the Division	3.48	Activities that address the Division domain	3.44
	Welcoming of members from various demographic groups	3.63	Efforts to reach out to international members	3.51
	Efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions	3.25	Opportunities outside of annual meeting to network/ collaborate with peers	2.97
	Encouragement from Division leaders to form network communities for people like me	3.08	Ability of interested members to become leaders in the Division	3.52
	Responsiveness of Division officers to member concerns	3.68	Opportunities to influence the Division	3.39
	Opportunities for members like me to receive mentoring	2.86	Selection process for awards and recognition	3.57
	Fair and open elections	3.92	Value of listservs	3.36
	Quality of newsletter	3.58	Usefulness of website	3.31
	Level of communication from the Division	3.44		

When it comes to the Division’s annual meeting program (see Table 16), it is clear that members are largely satisfied across all categories surveyed, including a high level of satisfaction with overall access to participation on the program (weighted average of 3.68 on a 5-point scale).

Professional development workshops have the highest level of satisfaction (3.70). Features of the main scholarly program all indicate strong levels of satisfaction: traditional paper sessions (3.56), symposia (3.64), discussion paper sessions (3.58) and plenaries (3.41). The high level of satisfaction with social and networking opportunities (3.66) reinforces efforts aimed at building and maintaining community.

Table 16: Member Survey – Satisfaction with features of CMS Division annual meeting program

Weighted average on a 5-point scale				
CMS Division	Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)	3.70	Plenaries	3.41
	Traditional paper sessions	3.56	Social and networking opportunities	3.66
	Discussion paper sessions	3.58	Overall access to participation on the program	3.68
	Symposia	3.64		

Notwithstanding the generally high level of satisfaction expressed by members across a range of areas, we do not take this for granted. Our aspirations and initiatives for the coming five-year period are aimed at ensuring continued satisfaction at such high levels. Hence, our wish to ascertain member interest in areas we are considering for improving or expanding service to members (see Table 17).

While members are more interested than not in all ten areas, the two areas of greatest interest are external relations (weighted average of 3.35 on a 5-point scale) and communities of practice (3.23). Given the Division’s domain, and continued concern about established management practices and the established social order, it is not surprising that members of the Division are interested in working with broader corporate, societal, and public policy issues. The interest in communities of practice can be further supported through small, regional or even topical conferences. In addition, we believe that we can leverage technology as a platform to connect like-minded scholars who want to pursue these interests via the new Connect@AOM.

In addition, the arrival of Connect@AOM will allow us build a repository for teaching, career and practitioner resources, along with affording us enhanced website functionality and the possibility to host online events. It will also support members to build communities of practice.

As already noted, mentoring/faculty needs are areas where we need to build greater understanding as to what it is that members would like and how best that can be brought about.

Table 17: Member Survey – Interest in areas for improving or expanding service to members

Weighted average on a 5-point scale	Communities of practice	3.23	Enhanced website functionality	2.88
		Online events	2.91	Mentoring for doctoral students
CMS Division	Teaching resources	3.16	Mentoring for junior faculty	2.94
	Career resources	2.62	Addressing senior faculty needs	2.79
	Practitioner resources	2.51	External relations	3.35

The travel bans of early 2017 saw members of the CMS community mobilize to both decry the bans and lobby the Academy to take a stand in defense of people’s rights and dignity. Such was the level of concern that the Division Executive carried out an email survey of Division members to seek their views on the travel bans, receiving 105 responses, which were compiled into a document titled [Response to the U.S. Executive Order on Travel and Immigration](#).

The travel ban was perceived by many Division members who responded as fundamentally unethical in terms of the Academy’s own Code of Ethics. The ban, and failure to speak out against it, was also seen as running contrary to the Division’s domain statement as an academic community that challenges racial inequality and discrimination through scholarship and education. As a member-led organization, and seeing it as our responsibility to act in solidarity with our members, we used the document as a basis from which to challenge the adequacy of the Academy’s response to the travel ban, and to work with other Academy divisions to call for change in the interests of our members.

Thus, we shared the document with the then Academy Board and the Task Force. We encouraged our members to engage constructively with the Task Force. Further, and following conversations with then Academy President, Anita McGahan, we worked together to build mutual understanding aimed at supporting the effort to change the Academy’s “political stands” policy.

As a Division, we responded to the invitation to all divisions to submit a proposal for an All-Academy Theme (*At the Interface*) session in Atlanta specifically addressing the relationship between national boundaries (and efforts to manage, control or change those boundaries) and our identity and work as management scholars. Our proposal — entitled “The borders of nations and of scholarship: At the interface of political and intellectual questions” — was one of a handful accepted and led to further engagement with Division members to inform the development of the workshop that was subsequently held.

In light of the above, we included a question in our member survey (see Table 18). Of those who responded to the question, over 86 per cent were satisfied with how the Division responded to the issue. When it came to how the Academy resolved the issue, about half those who responded indicated they were satisfied.

Table 18: Member Survey – Satisfaction with changing Academy’s “political stands” policy

	Yes	No
Satisfied with how CMS Division responded to issue (n = 167)	86.23%	13.77%
Satisfied with how Academy resolved issue (n = 154)	49.35%	50.65%

Overall, it is clear that members are satisfied with their membership of the Division, both in general and across a range of specific areas.

FINANCES

The Division receives funding from two sources: membership fees and sponsorships. As with all Academy divisions, the Division receives US\$11 for each member. No division receives funding from annual meeting fees paid by members; such fees go towards funding annual meeting costs.

In accordance with the Academy's funding formula, when membership is at or below 749 members, the Division receives an extra US\$1,000 from the Academy in recognition that there is a minimum operational cost that may not be fully covered through membership fees. When membership is at or above 750 members, the Division receives an extra US\$500 because the Academy presumes that larger membership generates more fees and a higher likelihood of additional fundraising opportunities. Thus, when membership numbers fall between 750 and 794 members, the Division actually receives less funding by way of membership fees than remaining at or below 749 members or reaching 795 members or above (see Table 19). This scenario has implications in terms of not just sustaining, but also reinvigorating, membership. It also has implications in terms of Division expenditures and attracting external funding.

Table 19: Membership thresholds and Division income

Membership	Membership Fees	Academy Supplement	Total	Difference over 749 members
749 members	US\$ 8,239	US\$ 1,000	US\$ 9,239	---
750 members	US\$ 8,250	US\$ 500	US\$ 8,750	- US\$ 489
795 members	US\$ 8,745	US\$ 500	US\$ 9,245	+ US\$ 6

Looking to finances (see Table 20), it is clear that the Division has been operating in surplus over the past five years. However, were it not for the additional funding secured through sponsorships, the Division would not be in a position to cover expenses from membership fees alone.

Table 20: Division finances (US\$)

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	5-year Average*
Membership Fees	8,805	9,151	8,997	8,992	8,937	8,976.40
Sponsorships	2,722.82	10,489.96	2,762	1,700	2,235	3,981.95
Total Funds (includes surplus carried over from previous year)	19,108.89	29,324.52	26,842.15	23,324.38	20,808.74	23,881.74
Total Expense	(9,425.33)	(14,241.37)	(14,209.77)	(13,687.64)	(12,677.52)	(12,848.32)
Surplus	9,683.56	15,083.15	12,632.38	9,636.74	8,131.22	11,033.41

Doing some further financial analysis (see Tables 21 and 22), it is clear that expenses, which largely comprise annual meeting costs (awards; food and beverage for the doctoral student and early career scholar consortia, the PDW and new member social, and the main social), are not sustainable without attracting additional external funding, such as sponsorships. Further, such external income is necessary to fund initiatives the Division pursues outside of the annual meeting.

Table 21: Analysis of Division finances (total expenses as % of income)

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	5-year Average
--	------	------	------	------	------	----------------

Total expense as % of membership fees	107%	156%	158%	152%	142%	143%
Total expense as % of total funds	49%	49%	53%	59%	61%	52%

When the surplus carryover has been stripped out (see Table 22), we have not been generating sufficient funds in each of the past three years to cover annual costs. As such, we have been relying on surpluses generated in, and carried over from, years prior to 2015 to cover the deficits incurred over the past three years, which is not sustainable in the long run.

Table 22: Analysis of annual Division finances (stripping out surplus carryover from year to year)

	2013 Orlando	2014 Philadelphia	2015 Vancouver	2016 Anaheim	2017 Atlanta	5-year Average
Meeting Costs	8,447.33	11,179.23	10,946.87	9,938.22	10,058.26	10,113.98
Membership Fees	8,805.00	9,151.00	8,997.00	8,992.00	8,937.00	8,976.40
Funding Difference	357.67	(2,028.23)	(1,949.87)	(946.22)	(1,121.26)	(1,137.58)
Other Expenses (Awards, Website, Newsletter, etc.)	(978.00)	(3,062.14)	(3,262.90)	(3,749.42)	(2,619.26)	(2,734)
Sponsorships	2,722.82	10,489.96	2,762	1,700	2,235	3,981.95
Surplus / (Deficit)	2,102.49	5,399.59	(2,450.77)	(2,995.64)	(1,505.52)	110.37

In sum, with a much firmer grasp on the Division's finances, we have work to do to: (a) sustain and reinvigorate our membership such that, as best as possible, we do not lose members once they join the Division; (b) contain expenses such that, as best as possible, they do not rise above the level of membership fee income; and (c) generate sufficient external funding through the likes of sponsorship to cover any expenses above the level of membership fees and provide the Division with a reasonably healthy surplus from year to year.

2013 DIVISION REVIEW: PROGRESS ON ISSUES/INITIATIVES

We are indebted to our colleagues who prepared the 2013 Division Review Report for the issues identified and initiatives outlined for the period 2013 to 2017, and to our colleagues over that same period who worked to address these issues and deliver on these initiatives. We are also grateful to the members of the Division and Interest Group Relations Committee (2013) who, along with celebrating the Division's many strengths, highlighted challenges to consider and address as best as possible in their thoughtful response. It is with these reports in mind that we now turn to addressing progress on issues and initiatives, along with challenges, identified in 2013.

DIVISION REVIEW REPORT (2013)

We turn first to the issues identified and initiatives outlined in the Division's 2013 review and note our observations on the progress made.

Issues/initiatives in the 2013 review report	Observations on progress made
Engaging de-marginalization of criticalities from a broader perspective	
<i>Reinforce the purpose of building a less geo-epistemic elitist atmosphere through criticalities (in plural), which enables the respectful engagement of Western academics with academics, practitioners and corresponding institutions who share other critical traditions.</i>	We have been working on this issue throughout the last few years and our success is evident in the numerous PDWs and symposia we have run expanding upon Global South perspectives and explicitly inviting more Global South scholars to present their work as a way to move us beyond the 'geo-epistemic elitist atmosphere' described in the previous report.
<i>Challenge our low self-esteem and foster the de-marginalization of criticalities (in plural) by recognizing and embracing even further the diverse traditions of critique and translating this endeavor into our statement domain (presenting it as a sort of "public good"). Rather than just enabling critical views we should foster the recognition, engagement and de-marginalization of criticalities (in plural) from diverse parts of the world".</i>	Based on the member survey, this has been achieved to a point, with more work to do. There certainly is no strong sense that the Division is marginalized within the Academy. The domain statement has not emerged as problematic in the 2017 member survey, nor has much of a sense of marginalization. What has emerged is a strong sense of the need for the CMS Division within the Academy, but with a more open /welcoming (less elitist / insular / inward looking), more critical (less cynical), more caring, more engaged within the Academy outlook and approach. Indeed, the survey indicates much goodwill amongst members for the Division to reach its potential within the Academy.
<i>Engage further with the other Divisions, especially those who face similar problems of marginality and legitimacy, in order to foster an incremental and sustainable process of de-marginalization aimed to enable criticalities to build better organizations, more human societies, and a more viable world system.</i>	This is an ongoing ambition of the Division and one that we will be actively pursuing in order to sustain and reinvigorate our membership, and to impact business school research and education in other divisions.
<i>Bring U.S. members back, with the support from the AOM, in order to create a more solid ground for de-marginalization of criticalities at large. In this respect it is a priority to undertake an investigation with ex-members who reside in the U.S.</i>	While the decline in U.S. membership has stabilized, the downward trajectory over the past five years could be to do with a declining critical scholarship presence in U.S. business schools or with retirements. We are not aware that an investigation has been done, but it is something we will act on in the early part of the coming five years.

Issues/initiatives in the 2013 review report	Observations on progress made
Building cross-divisional partnerships	
<i>Encourage further our members to present their work and contributions in sessions organized by other Divisions and also to submit work in conjunction with members of other Divisions. Innovative suggestions and experiences focused on joint initiatives with other Divisions should be encouraged and rewarded by our Committee.</i>	We understand that members value their cross-divisional membership and, as a result, are running PDWs and symposia co-sponsored by other divisions. We recognize the potential in building partnerships with other divisions in terms of sustaining and reinvigorating our membership, and this remains of interest for the coming five-year period.
<i>Open a new position of Representative-at-Large this year with a focus on Cross-Divisional issues is a way to respond to this challenging picture.</i>	This was not actioned and flows into our intention to review roles on the Division's Executive Committee so we can meet current and future needs.
<i>Keep attracting students from other Divisions and encouraging our students and members to engage the activities of other Divisions.</i>	While it was unspecified how this would be done, through our annual meeting consortia, we have been active in encouraging Division doctoral students and early career scholars to engage in the activities of other divisions.
<i>Reframing the cross-Divisional paper sessions within our community and working in conjunction with the AOM to make those sessions more interesting also to members of other Divisions.</i>	Efforts to this end have been growing and the Division Executive team in the last few cycles has made sure to engage divisions outside of CMS to better place our paper sessions in order to appeal to a wider group of scholars, including those who may have critical leanings.
<i>Sharing our international experience(s) and corresponding managerial capabilities with other Divisions and the AOM as a whole.</i>	Our international membership allows us to engage the Academy as a whole, inclusive of its leadership. For example, regarding the 2017 travel bans, the Division showed leadership in a situation where other divisions reached out to us and asked for advice and guidance, along with engaging extensively with AOM leadership. The CMS Division is ideally suited to informing Academy efforts, such as fostering more small conferences across the globe, while also able to contribute to them in ways that are non-colonizing.
Increasing and reframing students and new members	
<i>Take further the responsibility, together with the AOM and the other Divisions (especially with some of them) to create conditions to ensure that all (doctoral) students who participate in any CMS activities become members of the Division. It would also be very useful to raise funds targeted at subsidizing student attendance at the Meetings.</i>	We have sought to do this through the doctoral student and early career consortia. There is scope for more to be done through, for example, establishing a doctoral group (standing committee) to survey and address doctoral needs. What limited funds we have are targeted at outreach through our scholarly initiatives.
<i>Providing mentoring for junior faculty and for PhDs (apart from the Doctoral Consortium – which has been a fine example of success on our program). Organizing activities dedicated to PhD mentoring “outside” conference time, or in addition to the Doctoral Consortium are alternatives to fill this gap.</i>	This has been achieved to a degree with a mentoring program established as part of the doctoral student and early career consortia. There is scope for improvement by way of embedding such mentoring relationships through, for example, linking mentees and mentors beyond the confines of the annual meeting. This said, we are aware that the intensification of work is not to anyone's benefit, with established faculty under increasing pressure to deliver more with less, and doctoral students likewise under pressure.
<i>Encouraging students to address the impacts of “criticalities” vis-à-vis the purposes of building better organizations, more human societies and a more viable world system.</i>	This we do by way of the annual meeting doctoral student and early career consortia, and in PDW, symposia, and scholarly paper sessions.

Issues/initiatives in the 2013 review report	Observations on progress made
<i>Encouraging further engagement of those who do not attend the meeting and conduct further investigation to better understand the reasons for low attendance.</i>	We already have some understanding of this and we also know that members join the Division / AOM for reasons other than the annual meeting. Thus, the focus needs to be on what the Division offers members beyond the annual meeting and this is where Connect@AOM could be of significant benefit in building and strengthening community. Our communications —through our newsletter, website and Twitter presence— facilitate engagement with those who want to be part of the community without necessarily wanting to attend the annual meetings.
<i>De-marginalization of criticalities should be taken as a responsibility to be embraced by the Division in conjunction not only with the AOM Headquarters and the other Divisions, but also with society at large.</i>	This observation has been embedded into action by previous cycles of the Division Executive, as we work to expand notions of criticalities while also engaging additional divisions and AOM HQ. The conversations around the recent travel bans and the Division's response and contributions to efforts are one example of these actions.
Increasing member satisfaction and participation in Division tasks and activities	
<i>Devote more time, energy, and expertise to our web presence. We intend to achieve this by appointing a dedicated representative-at-large; we will also forge closer links with existing Critical Management Studies web presence.</i>	We developed a new website, along with establishing a Twitter presence (over 1,100 followers), both of which are the responsibility of a dedicated representative-at-large (for social media). We have volunteered to be amongst the first to adopt Connect@AOM, working in collaboration with a small number of other divisions and AOM HQ on the rollout. Having an existing web presence has made developing the CMS space on Connect@AOM less onerous in terms of building content, thus allowing for greater focus on actions geared towards building community.
<i>As members are consistently requesting more constructive, or positive, debate on alternatives to damaging or destructive management and organizational practice, we will make this a more prominent theme in our calls for workshop proposals and scholarly papers from 2014.</i>	This has been achieved at annual meetings since, with specific PDW, symposia and scholarly paper sessions dedicated to such themes, e.g., degrowth/moving beyond growth, possibilities for/in the Anthropocene, alternative organizations, rethinking and reshaping organizations within and without capitalism.
<i>Encourage students to sign up as reviewers.</i>	This has been achieved at annual meetings since. We actively solicit the support of all members annually through email and newsletter communications. We also thank reviewers personally by email and publicly acknowledge their important contribution through publishing a list of all reviewers in our newsletter and/or on our website.
<i>Give further support to teaching and learning-related activities on our conference programs.</i>	This has been achieved and continues, as we are aware that members value such activities. Further, the listservs have been used to request/receive input for potential course reading material and the community is very responsive to such requests. Connect@AOM will further facilitate these exchanges.
<i>Enhance the role and possibilities of social connections and consider ways to continue strengthening and extending opportunities for interaction between members and between members and other Divisions.</i>	Progress has been made here, e.g., the annual meeting socials, encouraging the input of more established scholars through mentoring doctoral students and early career scholars, utilizing Twitter, etc. There is scope for further actions through Connect@AOM.

Issues/initiatives in the 2013 review report	Observations on progress made
<i>Improve communications among members (including the listserv) and towards other Divisions and societies at large through our Newsletter.</i>	This has been achieved within the Division —along with the newsletter and website undergoing a re-design and establishing a Twitter presence— and the member survey indicates a high level of satisfaction with Division communications. The listservs have proven less attractive as a means of communication over recent years, with concern expressed that they are dominated by a small number of voices. They have also become a nuisance due to the level of advertising of calls for papers, etc., with members feeling they have little control over what messages they receive. Connect@AOM has the potential to overcome these shortcomings and facilitate more meaningful interactions.
Increasing practitioner membership and the profile of academically oriented practice	
<i>Attract further the interest of our members, members of other Divisions, and non-members of local communities to our CMS keynote sessions run by practitioners.</i>	This has been achieved through the activist speaker session and the likes of the GOOTH (get out of the hotels) initiative. Certainly, there is scope for greater engagement with practice.
<i>Build from within the legitimacy of further engagement of critters with practice and practitioners, both within organizations in the “world out there” and within academic institutions in general, also sharing the respective strategies of legitimation with other divisions given the widespread concern with the relevance of academic work and institutions in general.</i>	This is an area that warrants further development and we believe that the new technology platform, Connect@AOM, will allow us to realize this aspiration much more concretely than in previous years.
<i>Engage practitioners from academic institutions (e.g., Deans of B-schools, leaders of national or regional academies of management, and editors from different parts of the world) for the purpose of creating conditions for the sustainable de-marginalization of critique.</i>	This remains to be done and flows into our aspirations and initiatives for the coming five years.
A final consideration to open up possibilities	
<i>The many disincentives for the expression of criticalities in management, which could be of help for the construction of better organizations and societies might explain both the rather successful trajectory of the CMS group and the problems for its establishment as Division within the AOM structure. The overall condition of marginality attributed to critique makes the administration of this Division particularly challenging not only to the CMS Committee but perhaps also to the AOM.</i>	Perhaps the challenge remains, but we have a committed membership and we have the opportunity to present CMS as a force for change within the Academy. As the Academy’s 2016-17 President, Anita McGahan, said in her annual meeting address: “This is not an Academy of Business. This is the Academy of Management”. Indeed, we are the Academy that can contribute to addressing grand challenges, and CMS is well placed to play a leading role in doing so.
<i>This survey and the corresponding opportunity the Committee is experiencing to build and share a better understanding of who we are and what we might become have shown that the stigma on critique also affects us. We might look at ourselves more frequently and value without prejudice our practices and our firm commitment (many times without concessions) with the purpose of enabling the expression of critical views and criticalities in order to produce better organizations and societies (although we do not have a consensus a priori on what “better organizations” and “better societies” mean nor on how to achieve those ends).</i>	That opportunity remains and, as we mature as a Division, our members are keen that we do so. Since the last review, we sense more acceptance of critical views and criticality, e.g., the Academy’s 2013 annual meeting theme “Capitalism in Question”, the financial crisis, the travel ban, other concerning political shifts in Turkey, Europe, etc. As a Division, we continue to offer opportunity to potential members to join in delivering on this vision for a better future.

In sum, we very much echo the concluding sentiments to the Division’s 2013 Review Report, and our aspirations and initiatives for the coming five years build on these sentiments, to include developing pathways to realize our aspirations:

“We learned from this survey that members hold the Division in great esteem, but also note that it is challenging to ‘practice what we preach’ in terms of how we organize and frame ourselves. In particular, CMS promotes diversity, inclusion, and equality, all ideals that academic communities find troublesome to put into practice. We should keep learning from our own practices and continue to strive to achieve these ideals through increased attention to our administrative practice and continued dedication to creating a vibrant intellectual community that enhances the AOM and our societies.”

DIVISION & INTEREST GROUP RELATIONS COMMITTEE FEEDBACK (2013)

Following up on the feedback received from the Division and Interest Group Relations Committee on the Division’s 2013 Review Report, we note our observations on progress made.

<i>Feedback from the Division and Interest Group Relations Committee</i>	Observations on progress made
Strengths	
<i>THE CMS member survey yielded a response rate of 28%, well above this year’s overall average AOM response rate of 18%.</i>	The 2017 member survey yielded a response of just under 30%, which is ahead of the average of 27% for divisions completing reviews this cycle.
<i>Responding members are attached to the division, with 41% considering CMS as their primary divisional “home” within AOM (the highest of divisions and interest groups under review this year) and another 33% considering CMS and another division equally as their shared “home”.</i>	As indicated in the 2017 survey, members continue to identify strongly with the Division, with almost 80% of members considering the Division either their primary affiliation (69%) or one they identify with almost as much as their primary division (almost 10%).
<i>A large percentage (85%) of respondents expressed satisfaction with the division, and nearly 98% would likely recommend CMS to their colleagues.</i>	Member satisfaction (85%) with the Division remains as strong in 2017, with over 98% saying they would (78.5%) or possibly would (20%) recommend joining the Division to a colleague.
<i>Satisfaction also looks to be strong with respect to the CMS program at the annual conference, as well as with certain aspects of it, including the social and networking opportunities (nearly 87%), the PDWs and traditional paper sessions (both nearly 84%), and overall access to the program (85%).</i>	Satisfaction remains strong with all features of the Division’s annual meeting program. Excluding all who chose “N/A”, the level of satisfaction (extremely satisfied / very satisfied / satisfied) is above 86% for all features: PDWs (92%), traditional paper sessions (91%), discussion paper sessions (91%), symposia (91%), social and networking opportunities (88%), plenaries (86%), and overall access to participation in the program (89%).
<i>Cumulatively, the results suggest that respondents see excellent value from their membership.</i>	This remains the case five years hence.
<i>The report also shows that leadership cares about the future of the division. The division provides opportunity for critical theory scholars to meet, engage in academic debate, and facilitates the engagement of young scholars interested in this tradition of study.</i>	This remains as true today as it was five years ago. We have consistently been fortunate in attracting members who care about the Division and critical scholarship to join the leadership in serving our members and what the Division stands for.
<i>The DIGR Committee notes that the topics addressed by CMS scholars are important ones for AOM as a whole. CMS is a place where critical debate is the focus, and this kind of debate should exist somewhere within the Academy because it is an important component of academic thought.</i>	Indeed, this is something that is recognized by our members, as reflected in responses to the 2017 survey. Further, this has been reiterated by the Academy’s 2016-17 President, Anita McGahan, who is very encouraging of the contributions the Division can make to scholarship, practice, and the Academy.
<i>Strong internationalization</i>	Continues to be so, with initiatives to support our international members (e.g., funding to support workshops in France, India and the UK) and scope for more to do, for example, through Connect@AOM.

Feedback from the Division and Interest Group Relations Committee	Observations on progress made
<i>Successful initiatives, like “The Dark Side of Competition”, “Get Out of the Hotel” tours, and a biannual CMS workshop</i>	Continues. GOOTH (get out of the hotels) has been reinstated following an absence, which has been very well received by members and non-members (who attended).
<i>Healthy participation levels in division elections</i>	Higher than Academy levels over the past five years.
Challenges	
<i>Decreasing membership overall (19% over the 5 year review period vs. a 2.75% growth rate for the AOM overall), and differential patterns within specific categories. For example, student numbers have dropped appreciably from 2007 to 2012, showing a 35% decrease (compared to a 1% growth for AOM overall over the same time period). There are also fewer new members being drawn into the division as evidenced by a 15.5% decrease over the review period (compared to a decrease of approximately 1% for AOM overall over the same time period). Is the division becoming less attractive to new members? As for domestic/international breakdown, domestic rates of membership have dropped 9.5% over the review period as compared to a decline of 2% for the AOM overall. International has also dropped, though only by 2.2% as compared to a 4.4% increase for the AOM during the same review period. CMS is losing members, and they are losing at new members, student members and domestic members most specifically. The overall loss of membership is certainly troubling, but these differential patterns are also concerning. While there are still 700+ members who seem to be getting value from their membership, this trend needs to be curbed or reversed.</i>	The decline has been curbed and membership has stabilized at around the 750 mark. U.S. Academic membership has fallen since 2013, but seems to have stabilized. Comments from the 2017 member survey indicate members would like to see the Division grow, so our aspirations and initiatives for the next five years are targeted at addressing this. We will work to nurture doctoral students who have an affinity with CMS thinking, but not the network or resources. Likewise U.S. academics. Connect@AOM will help with this through facilitating interaction and enabling the building of a community knowledge resource, along with being of value to members who cannot make it to the annual meeting. Other possibilities include, as one member response suggested, offering “introduction to CMS” themed PDWs at the annual meeting, webinars, YouTube, etc.
Feedback from the Division and Interest Group Relations Committee	Observations on progress made
<i>Potential factions forming within the division. As noted in the report, there is a potential divide developing between North American and non North American perspectives on critical management studies.</i>	While there is definitely debate within the broader Critical Management Studies groups, there is no sign of fracture within the AOM CMS Division. On the contrary, the inclusiveness of the Division has been an important part and aim of the Division’s Executive Committee agenda, as recently evidenced by members standing together against the travel bans, and much effort has gone into sustaining inclusivity.
<i>Managing a large, international membership. While identified as a strength, the report also acknowledged that the large percentage of international members also presents a challenge. It has implications for some of the other challenges/concerns that are mentioned. For example, it is presumably responsible, at least in part, for low member attendance rates at the conference relative to the AOM at large and the other divisions/interest groups under review. The report also indicates that it can be a challenge to figure out how to deliver value to international members.</i>	Although the lower attendance rate is not unlikely to disappear, due to the highly international profile of the Division, we started to address this aspect through our funded scholarly initiative abroad, which provides funding of up to US\$500 for each of up to two such initiatives per year. To date, such funding has supported workshops in France, India and the UK. Also, the Division Executive has been aware for a time that an interactive communications platform would be of value to a division such as ours with a large international membership, and we anticipate the arrival of Connect@AOM will be of significant benefit in terms of the functionalities it will offer.

Feedback from the Division and Interest Group Relations Committee	Observations on progress made
<p><i>Low attendance rates at the conference and participation in CMS activities. As speculated in the report, this might owe in part to the large percentage of international membership relative to other divisions, in that it can be more difficult for international members to secure funding to attend the AOM meeting, as well as other logistical challenges (e.g., travel time, travel distance, etc.). It could also owe to the availability of other conferences, especially international, which cater to some of the same division content and that might compete for attendance from division membership, particularly when travel funds are limited.</i></p>	<p>The available data indicates that Division members have been attending in greater numbers since 2013, with the five-year change higher for the Division than the Academy. This said, and as the 2017 member survey indicates, funding and time are issues weighing on members' ability to attend, as is the attraction of other, more local (regionally) conferences. But, this does not mean that people do not wish to be members of the Division for other community benefits, which have the potential to be augmented through Connect@AOM.</p>
<p><i>Sense of marginalization. Perhaps as a consequence of this sense of marginalization, the report notes that the CMS division suffers from low self-esteem. Potential causes of this sense of marginalization are speculated upon in the report, but it is an attributed cause of several other concerns, such as a declining membership, limited job and publishing opportunities within the CMS domain, and inability to attract partnerships with other divisions, among other things. Several questions follow. Does CMS prefer this marginalized status? Does CMS marginalize itself? Does CMS want to be an integrated part of the AOM? Are the problems CMS is facing, which are attributed to marginalization and its consequences (membership decline, limited job and publishing opportunities, inability to attract collaborative activities with other divisions, etc.) unique to CMS, or do some other divisions deal with the same issues?</i></p>	<p>To the degree there may have been a feeling of low self-esteem at the time of the 2013 review, the member survey gives no such indication in 2017. While some admit to feeling uneasy admitting their affinity with CMS (due to the negative commentary this might elicit from non-CMS folk), there are many others who are comfortable in their affiliation and wish to see the Division expand its membership and reach within the Academy. Indeed, quite a few comments were to the effect of the good that CMS can do within the Academy at a time when questioning the status quo to address grand challenges is very much needed, very much echoing the sentiment of Anita McGahan's 2017 Presidential Address.</p>
<p><i>Overall conference submission rates by way of papers, symposia, and PDWs show quite a bit of variability over the review period. While this can be expected, partially dependent on conference location and economic conditions/funding availability, the swings (both in the positive and negative) tend to be wider than what is experienced overall within the AOM. And while the 5-year trend for paper submissions is positive (6.3%), it is well below the overall trend for AOM (31.4%).</i></p>	<p>This remains an issue and the swings remain. It is hard to know what the situation would have been with Atlanta had it not been for the U.S. President's travel bans. We are aware that our membership, particularly international members, were turned off by this and many decided not to attend the annual meeting as a result. We are aware that 2018 saw submissions rebound (130 papers, 12 symposia and 14 PDWs), which puts us within the ballpark of both 2015 (Vancouver) and 2016 (Anaheim). This said, as a Division with a large international membership, funding availability remains an issue.</p>
<p><i>Reviewer participation looks problematic, both for domestic and international reviewers, in that there are wide swings year-to-year across the review period.</i></p>	<p>Reviewer participation has not been a problem in recent years, with a healthy sign-up rate and adequate numbers to cover the level of submissions received. Indeed, when viewed in terms of the ratio of reviewers to submissions received, the Division's reviewer participation has exceeded that of the Academy by a wide margin over the past five years.</p>
<p><i>There is some concern that while there is good international representation on the leadership team, certain countries might be overrepresented.</i></p>	<p>We continuously endeavor to build a leadership team that is reflective of the membership base, all the while cognizant that we are dependent on the energies, time commitment and goodwill of those who step forward to volunteer for available positions. Currently, our leadership comprises members from the U.S., Ireland, the UK, New Zealand, Mexico, Belgium, France, India, Switzerland, and Brazil.</p>

Feedback from the Division and Interest Group Relations Committee	Observations on progress made
<i>Despite a track record of cross-divisional PDWs, there is still the general feeling (reinforced by responses on the survey) that there is a need to collaborate more with other divisions.</i>	A number of members in the 2017 survey suggest greater collaboration with other divisions. This is something worthwhile pursuing in terms of learning what collaborations currently exist between divisions to inform what sort of collaborations Division members would like to see. Such collaborations could also serve to build the Division's visibility with potential members.
<i>A good discussion/analysis of potential causes of decreasing membership. This can provide a starting point for developing specific plans for stemming the membership decline. But specific plans must follow, and the DIGR Committee notes the absence of a clearly developed plan for dealing with this.</i>	While efforts in the membership area have stabilized the Division's membership at around the 750 level, the issue of growth versus remaining pure is still a tension for the Division; we do not want our mission to be driven by numbers.
<i>A plan to dedicate a representative-at-large to investigating cross-divisional issues and opportunities for collaboration.</i>	This never came to fruition and flows through to our aspirations for the coming five years, with specific initiatives noted.
<i>An intent to focus on the website as a means for delivering additional member services/value and, subsequently, increasing member satisfaction.</i>	This was achieved, along with building an active Twitter presence. Our website is being superseded by Connect@AOM, which we are in the process of rolling out as an early adopter of the platform.
<i>Identification of a reasonable set of goals for the future.</i>	As noted in our observations, we believe a number of aspirations expressed in the 2013 report were addressed over the past five years. However, we recognize that the Division Executive could be more deliberate in setting out pathways to help us realize our aspirations.
Recommendations	
<i>Develop a clear direction for the division. This can include revisiting the domain statement, but should be a larger discussion than this. While this can include input from the membership, it should ultimately be the responsibility of the leadership team. Without a vital direction to the division with key initiatives, the division may drift rather than moving to meet its mission. As part of this process, several questions must be answered. Does CMS want to be small but 'pure', or does it seek to grow? Has the number of 'pure' CMS scholars reached a limit and, if so, does CMS need to broaden out its view of what constitutes critical management in order to appeal to a wider audience? How does this map onto the different CMS perspectives, specifically the North American vs. non North American perspective/approach to critical studies that are seemingly creating a divide within the division? On this last question, the recommendation of the DIGR committee is to develop a direction that will integrate the various perspectives on critical management studies. Of course, exactly how this divide can be bridged is, in no small part, as task of the leadership team. The result of this process should begin to address issues of marginalization as well as membership trends. On the latter, while important, membership should follow from a well-developed identity and strategic plan. Membership growth should not necessarily be the primary goal itself.</i>	There is an ongoing tension between remaining relatively small but "pure", and simply going for growth. There is no simple answer to this issue. The boundaries of what counts as "critical" are always permeable and negotiable, and change over time with wider intellectual and cultural trends. One person's purity might well be another person's "selling out". That said, the domain statement seems to be well accepted and has been relatively uncontentious in the last five years. We have addressed the issue of marginalization by firmly identifying ourselves —during 2017 internal debate around the U.S. President's travel bans— as within the Academy. Through our doctoral student and early career scholar consortia, we are reaching out to new members with an affinity for CMS. There is work to be done to reach out to mid-career scholars who, as one member commented in the survey, have an affinity for CMS and no longer have the pressures faced by doctoral students and junior faculty.

Feedback from the Division and Interest Group Relations Committee	Observations on progress made
<i>Following the efforts to establish a division direction/identity, appoint a membership task force to focus on member retention and recruitment.</i>	Now that membership has stabilized around the 750 member mark, and within most membership categories, it is opportune to establish such an ad hoc task force. It is worth noting that the Division's new member numbers over the past five years have grown at a faster pace than the Academy (both the 5-year and annual average change), which points to an issue with retention given overall membership has remained stable. We have already noted some of the reasons as to why we are losing members from year to year. The member survey also presents a number of suggestions relevant to particular member categories that will be worth pursuing further.
<i>Rather than or in addition to a representative-at-large, appoint a task force to investigate opportunities for cross-divisional collaboration.</i>	This remains to be done and flows through to our aspirations for the coming five years, with specific initiatives noted. And it can be done on the basis of demonstrating mutual relevance (as opposed to CMS only needing to demonstrate relevance).
<i>Compile election slates that draw on qualified candidates while also addressing diversity in terms of geographic region (internationalizing beyond Oceania and Brazil, where it seems like a lot of leadership is drawn from) and diversity in perspectives for critical management studies (e.g., North American and non North American).</i>	We have been successfully addressing this and it remains an ongoing aspiration to have a diversified leadership team.
<i>While finances were not identified as a concern (the division consistently operates in the black), CMS did state that the addition of a Treasurer was being considered. This needs to be done. A division needs to have a position dedicated to the division's finances.</i>	This has been delivered.
<i>You note on the H&G Checklist a need for more planning mechanisms but don't suggest a way forward. Consider utilizing a midyear meeting. While a physical meeting may not be possible due to geographic and financial constraints, a virtual meeting may prove useful. Planning is often difficult to accomplish with any necessary depth during a short session at the AOM meetings. This would also be a good way, potentially, to orient and integrate new officers.</i>	This has been partially achieved with more regular interactions asynchronously. However, more can be done.
<i>You note on the H&G Checklist that improvement is needed with respect to officers and key volunteers clearly understanding their roles. To facilitate this, you may want to consider developing a Policy Manual or similar repository of 'knowledge or procedures' relating to the division as well as transition documents that are passed from one officer to another as individuals progress through various positions and roles.</i>	This has been done, with potential for further improvement.
<i>Include a PDW at the conference that brings in senior scholars to focus on tips/strategies for publishing CMS manuscripts in top management journals.</i>	This forms part of the doctoral student and early career scholar consortia, and will be incorporated into the knowledge resource through Connect@AOM.
<i>Consider a new members' reception/meeting at the AOM meeting as a way of inculcating new members.</i>	This has been done by way of the PDW and New Member Social at the annual meeting. In line with our aspiration to sustain and reinvigorate our membership, scope will exist to develop other means for welcoming new members to the Division.
<i>Exploit the website as a mechanism for delivering member services and value beyond the conference, including for those who might not be able to attend the conference.</i>	This has been done to a point and will soon be superseded by the functionalities afforded by Connect@AOM, a platform the Division Executive has long recognized was needed.

ASPIRATIONS AND INITIATIVES — 2018 TO 2022

In outlining our aspirations and initiatives for the coming five year period, we are mindful of the need to balance our interest to build community with the need not to exhaust our officers, volunteers and members through asking too much of them. Indeed, work intensification is something that should be of concern to the Academy in general for its deleterious effects on the profession. For example, with faculty under pressure to deliver ever more with ever less, members have less time and energy available to devote to volunteering for such worthy endeavors as mentoring doctoral students and early career scholars.

Thus, we are conscious of the need to tailor all of our expectations to the medium term outlook of the coming five years, which will require that we translate our aspirations into pathways to guide us on our way, spreading the workload as fairly as possible, to include involving members as volunteers as much as possible where appropriate and necessary. To ensure we do our best to deliver on our aspirations for the future, we intend to review progress annually at the Division Executive Meeting.

Aspiration: To sustain and reinvigorate our membership.

- The issue of growth is still a tension for the Division and is part of the reason why we have not set a particular target for membership numbers; we do not want our mission to be driven by numbers. We see our value to our members and the Academy precisely in the issues and concerns we address and that others do not consider, as opposed to year-on-year membership growth as the criterion of division health and division *raison d'être*.
- As we have already established (see page 5), the Division is attracting new members each year, and doing so at an above average rate when compared with the Academy. However, it is also clear that the Division is losing members in almost equal measure, such that the overall membership number remains relatively static. Simply minimizing this annual loss would see our membership grow and provide us with further resources to fund initiatives.
- Thus, the Division Executive has work to do to build better insight into why we lose members (beyond the issue of lack of funding), along with insight into the needs of doctoral students and early career scholars who represent our future.
- Through ongoing engagement with our members, we will build understanding as to why members do not renew their membership from year to year with a view to seeing how we can encourage them to do so in the absence of attending the annual meeting, which requires membership to attend.
- To attract doctoral students and early career scholars to the Division, we will strengthen the existing consortia, building on initiatives that have already been tried and tested. In addition, we will invite our members to submit proposals to run at least one PDW session targeted at this group per annual meeting and publicize this session as widely as possible. Indeed, it could be that such proposals will come from doctoral students and early career scholars themselves.
- To add to this, we will invite doctoral student members to build a dedicated resource space within Connect@AOM to serve their needs, encouraging them to draw on the experience and expertise of other members as needed (by way of video contributions on particular topics, Q&A sessions on particular topics, etc.). We will invite early career scholars to do likewise. Such invitations may take the form of creating task forces and inviting participation from members.
- As we develop further insights into our membership, for example, exploring further the member survey according to varying criteria (age, gender, member type, geography, career stage, etc.), we will develop and introduce further initiatives aimed at realizing this aspiration.
- We also have the opportunity to leverage the functionality of Connect@AOM to engage with our members for their ideas to sustain and reinvigorate our membership, while at the same time continuing to meet their needs. For example, with many survey participants stating that

attending the annual meeting was not their primary benefit, it would be worthwhile to investigate what membership benefits they seek instead and how these could be delivered.

Aspiration: To build greater understanding of critical scholarship and teaching, allied with increasing visibility for the Division, within the Academy and beyond. This will also assist us in sustaining and reinvigorating our membership.

- There is work to do to determine how best to reach out to the wider Academy to build the Division profile and greater awareness of critical scholarship. This we can do, for example, building on Anita McGahan's Presidential Address challenging members of the Academy to not just study the difference between good and bad management but also to engage with the important problems of our time, noting, for example, "the problems of the vulnerable everywhere are our problems".
- Indeed, this observation chimes with business leaders becoming much more attuned to the role of business in society, e.g., [the Chief Executive and Founder of BlackRock, Lawrence Fink, recently wrote in a letter to chief executives of the largest public companies in the U.S. that more corporate social responsibility will be expected to keep the support of his investment firm:](#) "Society is demanding that companies, both public and private, serve a social purpose. To prosper over time, every company must not only deliver financial performance, but also show how it makes a positive contribution to society."
- There are many within the Academy who do not have sufficient awareness of the CMS Division or critical scholarship. Thus, to help with such an introduction, we will dedicate one PDW session per annual meeting to familiarize non-members with critical scholarship and publicize this session as widely as possible. We will invite our members to submit proposals to run this PDW, recognizing that it is to serve as an introduction for those who are unfamiliar with critical scholarship and how such scholarship can inform their own work. Where possible, we will capture these sessions (video, presentation material, etc.) and post to the Division's web space on Connect@AOM, further complimenting resources already available on the Division's website.
- To add to this, we will invite members to build a dedicated resource space within Connect@AOM that will serve as an introduction to critical scholarship for those new to the area and the Division.
- We intend to leverage relationships with other divisions with which we have significant numbers of members in common (e.g., GDO, OMT, ONE, PNP, SIM), through our officers and our members, to build greater understanding of critical scholarship and teaching, increase collaboration, and reinvigorate our membership.
- We intend to leverage Academy media to build greater awareness and understanding of critical scholarship and teaching with the wider Academy membership. As indicated by a member in the survey: "I perceive CMS to be relatively isolated and believe that it is important for the Division to continue to try and work collaboratively and effectively in integrating CMS perspectives within those of other divisions...In short, strengthen multidisciplinary, multi-perspective questions and research. Encourage deep thought and action". Thus, as a Division, we envision a more interdisciplinary and collaborative future, working alongside other divisions and engaging more purposefully with critical scholars, especially (but not only) in the U.S., where membership has fallen.
- In an increasingly polarized society, critical voices are becoming more numerous, which presents possibilities to connect to other 'communities of practice' beyond for-profit organizations. This links with feedback through the member survey, which indicates strong interest in external relations and communities of practice. Given the Division's domain, and continued concern about established management practices and the established social order, it is not surprising that members of the Division are interested in working with broader corporate, societal, and public policy issues. It also links with the sort of broader engagement called for by Anita McGahan in her 2017 Presidential Address.
- In practicing what we preach, we recently introduced a unique role of Representative-at-Large for Ethics and Inclusion, with a special focus on sexism and gender, as part of our efforts to

surface and challenge power and domination within our community. This we have done to not only sustain our community but also reinvigorate it by attracting, amongst others, younger and newer scholars of all genders, many of whom are actively looking for inclusive spaces where oppressive and exploitative practices are challenged. Aware that such concerns are not particular to our Division alone, we see this role developing over the coming five years, to include working with other divisions and the Academy to (continue to) address issues of ethics and inclusion.

Aspiration: To build community alongside the annual meeting. This will also assist us in sustaining and reinvigorating our membership.

- We are aware that there are members who are unable to attend the annual meeting for a variety of reasons, not least of which is cost and availability of funding. We are also aware from the member survey of calls for meetings to be held outside of the U.S. The Division has partly addressed such calls through its funded scholarly initiative, which provides funding of up to US\$500 for each of up to two such initiatives per year. To date, such funding has supported workshops in France, India and the U.K.
- Cognizant of the Academy's small conferences initiative, along with being aware of the bi-annual CMS International Conference amongst many conference possibilities, we will engage with our members and with other divisions with which we have significant numbers of members in common to assess the demand and explore possibilities for small conferences outside of the annual meeting.
- We will leverage the functionalities and capabilities of Connect@AOM for members to gain and share information relevant to research and teaching, which will assist in developing and maintaining connections and so support community building. These aspirations are in line with member requests, such as "set regional working groups, because meeting once a year is not enough. Alternatively, focus more on social media and have more active discussions on research and activism, for instance".

Aspiration: To provide opportunities for engaged critical research.

- As a Division, we have done well in articulating and examining the intersections of business and society, but would like to do more in terms of critically engaged research or research that aims to address directly the challenges we face in the (organizational) world today. As pointed out by members in the survey, as a Division, we want to "claim the (critical) action research agenda as our own and thus recruit people who want to actually do responsive things rather than critically observe".
- This aspiration is in line with many member requests to move beyond a passive critical stance to a more activist stance that aims to use our research to address ongoing issues, including calls to "start promoting community engaged research including, but not limited to, social media, special issues, symposiums, reports". We believe that the move to Connect@AOM will facilitate these ambitions, as we are able to leverage technology to support a global network and community of critically engaged scholars led by the Division.

Aspiration: To provide more support and engagement opportunities for doctoral students and early career scholars. This will also assist us in sustaining and reinvigorating our membership.

- This aspiration arrives out of member survey answers that ask the Division to provide more dedicated space, resources and time to supporting and growing the opportunities for doctoral students and early career scholars in the Division.
- We will look at ways to connect with doctoral students and early career scholars to ensure their voices are heard, and needs are met, within our Division. Thus, we will look at creating either dedicated representative-at-large positions –one doctoral student and one early career scholar— or standing committees —one comprising doctoral students and another comprising early career scholars— to propose, organize and coordinate activities aimed at bringing new

doctoral students and early careers scholars to our community and opening participation spaces for existing doctoral student and early career scholar members.

- We aim to provide more opportunities to speak to publishing critical work and connecting with like-minded scholars over the course of the year beyond just conferences. Again, we will rely on Connect@AOM to facilitate these actions.
- In addition, we aim to reach out to members and journals to find financial support for activities and meetings to support these specific needs at the main conference. Also, and subject to available resources, we will put together smaller, focused and regional conferences to facilitate the development of our doctoral student and early career scholar members.
- This aspiration aligns well with our aims to sustain and reinvigorate our membership by providing dedicated space on Connect@AOM for doctoral students and early career scholars, but also is differentiated in that once such individuals are part of the Division, we aim to provide PDWs and other sessions, such as meet members of the Division who are journal editors to talk about how to get critical work published, to ensure continued support.

Aspiration: To translate our aspirations and initiatives into practice through developing pathways to guide us on our way, along with reviewing the roles of members of the Division's Executive Committee and engaging volunteers to ensure we can realize our aspirations.

- While we very much have aspirations for the Division, we do not always fully realize those aspirations through want of clearly articulated pathways. To this end, we will translate our aspirations into pathways that will help in guiding us to where we aspire to go.
- As we look forward, we recognize the need to review the Division's Executive Committee roles to ensure we have the structure needed, and can draw on the talents and energies of our membership, to realize our aspirations.
- Also looking forward, we recognize that we can engage the talents and energies of our membership as volunteers in areas that will help us better meet the needs of varying constituencies, e.g., doctoral students, early career scholars, etc. In so doing, we will contribute to our aspiration to sustain and reinvigorate our membership.
- This aspiration addresses challenges acknowledged in the 2013 Division Review Report and noted in the Division and Interest Group Relations Committee's response to same.

Aspiration: To fund and operate the Division in a sustainable manner.

- With a firmer grasp of Division finances, we have work to do to: (a) sustain and reinvigorate our membership such that, as best as possible, we do not lose members once they join the Division; (b) contain expenses such that, as best as possible, they do not rise above the level of membership fee income; and (c) generate sufficient external funding through the likes of sponsorship to cover any expenses above the level of membership fees and provide the Division with a reasonably healthy surplus from year to year.

APPENDIX A – SUPPLEMENTARY DATA TABLES

Table A1: Member Survey Profile – Length of Membership

	0-3 years	4-7 years	8-11 years	12-15 years	15+ years
CMS Division	45.21%	21.46%	15.07%	8.68%	9.59%

Table A2: Member Survey Profile – Membership Type

	Academic	Student	Executive / Practitioner	Emeritus
CMS Division	78.90%	14.68%	5.05%	1.38%

Table A3: Member Survey Profile – Work Region Residence

	Asia	5.02%	Central America	0.00%
CMS Division	Middle East	0.00%	The Caribbean	0.46%
	North Africa and Greater Arabia	0.00%	South America	6.85%
	Europe	38.81%	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.46%
	North America	38.81%	Australia and Oceania	9.59%

Table A4: Member Survey Profile – Gender

	Male	Female	Transgender	Prefer not to answer	Other
CMS Division	52.97%	45.66%	0.00%	1.37%	0.00%

Table A5: Member Survey Profile – Age

	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80+
CMS Division	3.23%	18.43%	27.65%	28.11%	19.35%	2.76%	0.46%

Table A6: U.S. Membership by Member Type

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	5-year change	Annual Avg. Change
CMS Academic	153	152	149	136	138	-9.80%	-2.55%
CMS Emeritus	7	8	9	11	12	71.43%	14.42%
CMS Executive	31	26	35	20	22	-29.03%	-8.22%
CMS Student	60	48	51	52	45	-25.00%	-6.94%
CMS Total	251	234	244	219	217	-13.55%	-3.57%
<i>AOM Academic</i>	<i>6,558</i>	<i>6,545</i>	<i>6,425</i>	<i>6,678</i>	<i>6,783</i>	<i>3.43%</i>	<i>0.85%</i>
<i>AOM Emeritus</i>	<i>258</i>	<i>285</i>	<i>299</i>	<i>309</i>	<i>317</i>	<i>22.87%</i>	<i>5.28%</i>
<i>AOM Executive</i>	<i>748</i>	<i>774</i>	<i>761</i>	<i>685</i>	<i>660</i>	<i>-11.76%</i>	<i>-3.08%</i>
<i>AOM Student</i>	<i>2,741</i>	<i>2,592</i>	<i>2,502</i>	<i>2,399</i>	<i>2,473</i>	<i>-9.78%</i>	<i>-2.54%</i>
<i>AOM Total</i>	<i>10,305</i>	<i>10,196</i>	<i>9,987</i>	<i>10,071</i>	<i>10,233</i>	<i>-0.70%</i>	<i>-0.18%</i>

Table A7: International Membership by Member Type

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	5-year change	Annual Avg. Change
CMS Academic	379	386	426	435	407	7.39%	1.80%
CMS Emeritus	6	5	5	5	6	0.00%	0.00%
CMS Executive	25	27	25	18	21	-16.00%	-4.27%
CMS Student	80	75	72	92	92	15.00%	3.56%
CMS Total	490	493	528	550	526	7.35%	1.79%
AOM Academic	6,247	6,275	6,605	6,875	6,836	9.43%	2.28%
AOM Emeritus	91	95	106	93	94	3.30%	0.81%
AOM Executive	636	636	632	564	493	-22.48%	-6.17%
AOM Student	2,076	2,139	2,251	2,449	2,545	22.59%	5.22%
AOM Total	9,050	9,145	9,594	9,981	9,968	10.14%	2.44%

Table A8: U.S. Annual Meeting Registrants by Member Type

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	5-year change	Annual Avg. Change
CMS Academic	68	88	78	68	69	1.47%	-0.36%
CMS Emeritus	1	2	3	3	2	100.00%	-15.91%
CMS Executive	5	7	4	3	4	-20.00%	-6.09%
CMS Student	14	19	22	30	18	28.57%	-6.09%
CMS Total	88	116	107	104	93	5.68%	-1.37%
AOM Academic	2,810	3,095	3,131	3,015	3,165	12.74%	-2.95%
AOM Emeritus	43	63	51	55	63	46.51%	-9.11%
AOM Executive	135	180	156	131	117	-13.33%	3.64%
AOM Student	1,396	1,510	1,318	1,428	1,571	12.54%	-2.91%
AOM Total	4,384	4,848	4,656	4,629	4,919	12.20%	-2.84%

Table A9: International Annual Meeting Registrants by Member Type

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	5-year change	Annual Avg. Change
CMS Academic	116	205	219	171	147	26.72%	-5.75%
CMS Emeritus	0	0	0	0	1	---	---
CMS Executive	4	1	4	2	4	0.00%	0.00%
CMS Student	33	35	52	44	39	18.18%	-4.09%
CMS Total	153	241	275	217	191	24.84%	-5.39%
AOM Academic	2,341	2,755	3,338	2,937	2,760	17.90%	-4.03%
AOM Emeritus	8	15	9	16	13	62.50%	-11.43%
AOM Executive	200	155	219	140	136	-32.00%	10.12%
AOM Student	973	1,103	1,287	1,289	1,272	30.73%	-6.48%
AOM Total	3,522	4,028	4,853	4,382	4,181	18.71%	-4.20%

Table A10: Annual Meeting Submissions by Type

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
CMS Papers Submitted	103	108	135	120	80
CMS Papers Accepted	69	66	85	71	59
CMS Symposia Submitted	15	13	13	16	10
CMS Symposia Accepted	9	8	12	15	5
CMS PDWs Submitted	11	13	22	8	13
CMS PDWs Accepted	10	10	11	8	10
CMS Total Submissions Received	129	134	170	144	103
CMS Total Submissions Accepted	88	84	108	94	74
<i>AOM Papers Submitted</i>	<i>6,190</i>	<i>6,151</i>	<i>7,045</i>	<i>6,644</i>	<i>6,342</i>
<i>AOM Paper Accepted</i>	<i>2,887</i>	<i>3,291</i>	<i>3,646</i>	<i>3,876</i>	<i>3,824</i>
<i>AOM Symposia Submitted</i>	<i>762</i>	<i>896</i>	<i>1,082</i>	<i>964</i>	<i>1,004</i>
<i>AOM Symposia Accepted</i>	<i>504</i>	<i>660</i>	<i>846</i>	<i>806</i>	<i>866</i>
<i>AOM PDWs Submitted</i>	<i>454</i>	<i>626</i>	<i>587</i>	<i>527</i>	<i>505</i>
<i>AOM PDWs Accepted</i>	<i>357</i>	<i>544</i>	<i>418</i>	<i>384</i>	<i>396</i>
<i>AOM Total Submissions Received</i>	<i>7,406</i>	<i>7,673</i>	<i>8,714</i>	<i>8,135</i>	<i>7,851</i>
<i>AOM Total Submissions Accepted</i>	<i>3,748</i>	<i>4,495</i>	<i>4,910</i>	<i>5,066</i>	<i>5,086</i>

APPENDIX B – HEALTH & GOVERNANCE CHECKLIST

The purpose of this checklist is to monitor basic division/interest group health and governance. It is intended to stimulate conversation among the officers and prompt reflection. Copies of documents referenced in the checklist are **NOT** being requested. For each item please share an example that illustrates your answer or a quick idea for improvement, where applicable. Officers should expand on items calling for improvement in their report.

<u>Bylaws and Domain</u>	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement	No
<p>1. <i>The division/interest group's bylaws are up to date and periodically reviewed and revised, if necessary.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: The Division's bylaws are reviewed periodically. Following on from the Division's current five-year review, we will be updating the bylaws this calendar year to reflect anticipated changes in Executive Committee structure.</p>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<p>2. <i>The division/interest group's domain statement is current and activities reflect its full scope.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: The CMS Division continues to operate in accordance with its domain statement. For example, the Division was actively engaged with the process to amend the Academy's "political stands" policy in response to the US President's Executive Orders banning travel from a number of Muslim-majority countries. In keeping with being a member-led organization, we surveyed the CMS membership (generating 105 responses) in relation to the travel bans and shared the results with the Academy leadership and the subsequent Academy Task Force, along with engaging in constructive dialogue with the Academy President (Anita McGahan) in support of her leadership on the issue.</p>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<p>3. <i>The division/interest group conforms to all official Academy policies as detailed in the Division and Interest Group Chair's Guidebook.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: Having reviewed Academy policies detailed in the Division and Interest Group Chair's Guidebook, to the best of our knowledge, the Division conforms to all such official policies.</p>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<u>Membership</u>	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement	No
<p>4. <i>Membership statistics are periodically reviewed to understand trends (growth, decline) and who the division/interest group is serving (students, academics, practitioners, emeritus, international, etc.)</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: At every Academy meeting, we review membership statistics at both the Division Executive Meeting and the Division Business Meeting. However, as we discuss in the Division Review Report, we intend to develop better insight into our member constituencies as part of our aspiration to sustain and reinvigorate our membership.</p>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

<u>Membership (continued)</u>	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement	No
<p>5. <i>The division/interest group delivers programs/services for all member constituencies.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: We are conscious of our various constituencies —U.S., international, academic (senior, mid-career and junior), executive and student— and endeavor to deliver programs and services that meet their needs. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each year at the Academy meeting, we run doctoral student and junior faculty consortia, which also involve senior and mid-career academics as mentors; • Our annual awards seek to recognize the achievements of members across our various constituencies; • Our annual meeting program contains a range of sessions related to scholarship, teaching and activism; and • Recognizing that not all members can make it to the annual meeting, we actively support small gatherings that bring together members and potential members around the world. 	X		
<u>Finance</u>	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement	No
<p>6. <i>At least one person has responsibility for reviewing and understanding the division/interest group's financial reports.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: The Division has a dedicated Treasurer role with responsibility for reviewing and understanding the Division's finances, along with responsibility for driving the sourcing of supplementary funds through the likes of sponsorships.</p>	X		
<p>7. <i>The division/interest group follows the Academy's financial policies, and routinely operates in the black.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: The Division has been operating in the black over the period under review and maintains a healthy surplus. Sponsorships have been and continue to be pursued to supplement Division finances.</p>	X		
<p>8. <i>If feasible, the division encourages outside sponsorship to extend its resources.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: Over the period under review, the Division has actively sought and secured a number of sponsorships that support general operations and specific activities (e.g., awards). The Division is continuing with this policy under the leadership of the Treasurer.</p>	X		
<u>Governance</u>	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement	No
<p>9. <i>Periodic planning takes place to consider how the division/interest group might meet new challenges and opportunities.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: Outside of the annual meeting, the Division Executive Committee remains in regular communication by way of available synchronous and asynchronous technologies to engage with necessary periodic planning. This said, with the arrival of Connect@AOM, it is opportune to review the Division's Executive Committee structure to ensure we have the roles, and officers, needed to deliver for our members into the future. Scope also exists to engage the membership more broadly by way of ad-hoc committees to look at specific challenges and opportunities that arise, e.g., initiatives and pathways to sustain and reinvigorate our membership.</p>		X	

<u>Governance (continued)</u>	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement	No
<p>10. <i>There is a climate of mutual trust and respect among the officers.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: Most definitely. Officers of the Division Executive work collegially and very well together, with support very much forthcoming when needed. Altogether, there is a strong and healthy climate of mutual trust and respect.</p>	X		
<p>11. <i>The respective roles of officers and key volunteers are understood and some level of orientation/guidance takes place.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: Every year, the incoming Division Chair revises and circulates detail of the roles and responsibilities of each officer for the year ahead. Further, there is a handover process each year, where those incoming to a role are briefed by those outgoing, to include being provided with written guidance accumulated and updated over the years by those who occupied the role. Further, relevant documentation is archived on the Division Google Drive (filed according to Annual Meeting Organization, Communications, Division Organization, Finances) that can be accessed by all current officers. With the arrival of Connect@AOM, this archive will move to the new platform for the benefit of future generations of Division officers.</p>	X		
<p>12. <i>The division/interest group actively attempts to involve members in volunteer and leadership positions, including international members and other underrepresented populations.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: The Division actively seeks to involve members in all activities through active communications (by newsletter, listserv, website, social media and email). The existing Division Executive is fairly representative of our various constituencies (geographic, career level, gender, age, etc.) and we continue to encourage members from all constituencies to run for leadership positions and become involved as volunteers. Thus, for example, as part of the rollout of Connect@AOM, we reached out to the entire membership to recruit volunteers to assist with the rollout and we made a conscious effort to recruit volunteers representative of our various constituencies.</p>	X		
<p>13. <i>The current governance and committee structure serves the division/interest group well.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: The current Division structure has served the Division well to this point. With the arrival of Connect@AOM, we are taking the opportunity to update the current structure in line with the five-year review.</p>	X		
<p>14. <i>The division/interest group has a fair and open process for nominations and elections.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: Each year, under the leadership of the Past Division Chair, we reach out to the membership, encouraging and inviting members to nominate themselves or colleagues for available officer positions. We invite anyone interested to contact any member of the Division Executive, past or present, should they wish to learn more about any of the positions. To all intents and purposes, we follow a fair and open process for both nominations and the election proper, including respecting the Academy's 'campaigning philosophy'.</p>	X		

<u>Programs/Activities</u>	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement	No
<p>15. <i>The officers periodically consider adopting new programs and modifying or discontinuing others. They know the strengths and weaknesses of their programs.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: As already remarked, the Division Executive noted a desire among members for the Division to support small group, scholarly initiatives outside of the annual meeting. Following a pilot phase, the Executive put in place and communicated a formal process to apply for funding to facilitate such initiatives.</p>	X		
<p>16. <i>Scholarships, travel stipends, or other funding programs are transparent and open to all who are eligible.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: The Division does not fund scholarships or travel stipends. In 2014 and 2015, the Division had the chance to support a number of local workshops focused on issues of concern in smaller groups to encourage diversity within the Division and as an expression of solidarity with such member-led initiatives. Flowing from this experience, and to ensure a transparent process open to all members, the Division Executive formalized support for up to two workshops per year and put an accessible application process in place. The funding support is communicated to the entire membership through the Division newsletter, website and email.</p>	X		
<p>17. <i>The division/interest group has well publicized recognition programs (for service, scholarly contributions, etc.) <u>and</u> the criteria for awards are transparent.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: Each year, the Division recognizes the authors of best papers, doctoral dissertation, and case study competition, along with recognizing the efforts of annual meeting submission reviewers through an award for best reviewer. The Division website contains information on the various awards, with the newsletter also used to publicize the awards (and the subsequent recipients) each year. While we have clear criteria for all awards, they are not necessarily as visible as they should be in all cases. Thus, we need to improve visibility as part of publicizing awards. Separately, the Division recognizes the contributions of all annual meeting reviewers in the newsletter and/or on our website. We also recognize retiring officers of the Executive for their service, leadership and camaraderie.</p>		X	
<p>18. <i>The division/interest provides opportunities and services to members with different interests, including teaching, research and practice-based interests.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: The Division very much encourages the different interests of members through the annual calls for the professional development workshop and main scholarly programs. The Division website also provides resources in keeping with members' different interests. The arrival of Connect@AOM will allow for members to generate resources for one another according to their varied interests, thereby better serving member needs.</p>	X		
<p>19. <i>Services to members extend beyond those provided at the annual meeting.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: Beyond the annual meeting, services to members include the quarterly newsletter, the website, social media updates, the listservs, and funding support for scholarly initiatives.</p>	X		

<u>Programs/Activities (continued)</u>	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement	No
<p>20. <i>The division/interest group carries out regular communication with members (minimally including a newsletter and up-to-date website).</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: Members receive four newsletters per year, have access to a dedicated website (which is regularly updated), can receive regular updates through the Division Twitter feed and listservs, and receive ad-hoc emails as the need arises.</p>	X		
<p>21. <i>The division/interest group actively works to build community (communities of practice, listservs, collaboration activities, social and special events) etc.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: Community building is very important to the Division and is something that is both welcomed and appreciated by members. The annual meeting presents opportunities for members to come together informally through the two Division socials (with one specifically dedicated to welcoming new members). The quarterly newsletter, website, Twitter presence and listservs assist in keeping members informed and connected to the Division. Funding for scholarly initiatives affords opportunities to build community through facilitating members and potential members in coming together, more locally and in smaller groups, around particular interests, issues or concerns. The arrival of Connect@AOM will offer members of the Division a more meaningful interactive experience than our current technology offers, along with creating and building a knowledge resource.</p>	X		
<p>22. <i>The division/interest group actively strives to improve the annual meeting program by periodically reviewing program statistics to monitor meeting trends.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: Each year, we review the meeting program statistics and trends, formally at the Division Executive and Business Meetings and in the Division newsletter, and informally in discussions between officers of the Executive throughout the year. In terms of annual meeting submissions, we actively encourage members to submit their papers, symposia, case studies and workshops through multiple rounds communicating the calls for submissions by email, on the website, in the newsletter, through the listservs, and via Twitter. We do the same when it comes to encouraging members to sign-up as reviewers, sending personalized emails (and follow up reminders to those not already signed up), along with being sure to thank reviewers by way of personalized email and by name in the newsletter and on the website for their service to the Division. Of course, there is always room for improvement and we remain ever conscious as to how we can best do so.</p>	X		
<p>23. <i>Collaboration exists with other division/interest groups in the Academy.</i></p> <p>Example/quick idea: Per se, as a Division, we do not seem to have a formal approach on collaboration with other divisions and interest groups. Collaboration exists to the extent of co-sponsoring professional development workshops and symposia. Informally, officers of the Executive communicate with officers of other divisions to share ideas and experiences. This is an area where the DIGR Committee could be of assistance in terms of what it knows about the collaborations that exist between other Academy divisions and interest groups to share with us.</p>		X	